

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

PROFESSOR ELMSLIE.

My acquaintance with Professor Elmslie began in the end of the year 1868, when I arrived in Edinburgh from Australia, to begin my theological studies at the New College. When the classes met he was pointed out to me as the best man of our year, the winner of the highest scholarship at the entrance examination, and the best student of his time at Aberdeen. He was then a smallish, fair-haired youth, with a singularly bright and keen expression, and there was something about his face which then and afterwards reminded me greatly of what Chaucer tells us of his own appearance. For Elmslie too was "small and faire of face," and seemed "elvish by his countenance." When I came to know him well, I always thought this fancy to have been just; for in many respects, in his cheerful courage, in his humour, in his keen observation and amused tolerance of the pettinesses and weaknesses of human nature, and in the graphic power with which he could depict them, he recalled, *longo intervallo* of course, but still he did recall, the most human and humorously keen of all our poets.

As a stranger, coming from what was then considered almost a foreign land, I did not easily learn to know the Scottish students. It was consequently far on in the session before I made Elmslie's acquaintance, though he sat within one place of me in Dr. Davidson's class-room. The man who separated us was not interested in Hebrew, and whenever he was called upon in the class, he turned in haste, first to Elmslie on his right hand, and then to me on his left, seeking material to satisfy his keen, and some-

times sarcastic, examiner. At first we gave him what help he needed; but at last his interruptions became intolerable, and we simultaneously determined to eject our tormentor. Co-operation in this delicate manœuvre made us known to each other, and from that time till the end of our Edinburgh career we practically had all things in common—work, amusements, and interests.

But at first, for a short time, I did not think it would be so. For a week or two I could get nothing from him but jocularities of various kinds. This provoked me greatly; for, from his look and his reputation, I felt sure there was much more in him than that. But I had begun to think I should make nothing of him, when quite suddenly he withdrew the veil in which, from shyness, he had wrapt himself, and the depth and earnestness of his nature then stood revealed. Throughout life he often acted in this way, and I have known men who got and kept an entirely false impression of his character from his habit of thus disguising himself. To those who knew him however this excess of jocularities, when it reappeared, was always a sign that he was either ill or anxious, or that he was among people whom he did not know, or whom he did not wish to know him. I say this excess of jocularities; for his humour was perennial, and welled up in his talk with an irresistible flow. But it generally was of that kind which is born of intense scrutiny of the deepest problems, and both concealed and revealed a quite exquisite tenderness and sympathy. Often however it was merely the natural outcome of his bright and cheerful nature. But it was always totally without bitterness, and even in those days he rarely uttered a sarcasm.

Soon after we became intimate, I had an experience of his humorous mischief. We often met in hospitable Edinburgh drawing-rooms, and I soon noticed that on these occasions those with whom I talked spoke with mysterious reserves. They carefully abstained from inquiring as to

when and how my connexion with Australia began, and when they did touch upon the unhappy circumstances of the earliest settlers, they magnified their few virtues, and said nothing of their thousand crimes. This struck me as odd, and I was at great pains to give lessons in geography, to prove that Melbourne was as remote from the only convict settlement now existing as London is from Gibraltar. On consulting Elmslie about the matter however, I found that he was the cause of the whole phenomenon. He confessed that he generally went round the room just before me, telling every one, with a compassionate look, that I had just come from Australia—"Botany Bay, you know"; and that he had then spent the rest of the evening in laughing inwardly at the reception I met with, and at the growth of my perplexed astonishment.

With regard to mental tastes and aptitudes, when I first knew him there was, I think, no one emphatically pronounced. He was merely hungry for knowledge of all kinds. If any subject had fascinated him more than another, it probably was mathematics, and he used to dilate with enthusiasm on the sense of power which the command of the higher mathematical processes gave. But though he had more than one opportunity of going to Cambridge put in his way, and though he must certainly have taken a high place among mathematical scholars there, he had too much sympathy with humanity to devote himself entirely to a course of study so abstract; for his vigorous religious life had only strengthened natural tendencies which would alone have made the study of mankind, with their needs and sorrows, supremely attractive to him.

What most struck us who knew him best was the rare and extraordinary soundness and balance of his mind. He was keen and observant and analytic enough to have become a prominent man of science; his perception of the weaknesses and basenesses of human nature was so un-

sparingly accurate, that he might easily have fallen into the bitterness of cynicism ; and he was conspicuous for the cool, hard sense which his countrymen so often possess. But with all that he had an absolute faith in the ideal as the true guide for his own life, and his belief in the existence of an ideal element in every human being was so strong, that even without Christ he would have loved men. His toleration for error and aberration of all kinds was consequently almost boundless, yet his power of moral indignation was extremely great. Indeed, I have never known a man of his age so free from excess or morbidity of any kind. While others of us, in the crisis of our *Sturm und Drang Periode*, were alternating between an unreasonable optimism and an equally unreasonable despondency, he never bated "a jot of heart or hope, but steered right onward."

I have said that the college influences were very potent ; and they were so, primarily, owing to the way in which Dr. Rainy, Professor of Church History, and Dr. Davidson, Professor of Hebrew, impressed themselves upon the students. In other classes there was good teaching ; here there was a great deal more, there was formative power. Men of ability therefore rarely left the Hebrew or Church history classes without having had their thoughts profoundly modified, and for life. Elmslie was no exception to this rule. In his first year he did not, it is true, get the prize for Hebrew ; but he eagerly drank in the lectures, only too rare, in which Dr. Davidson discussed methods of interpretation and the fundamental points in Old Testament religion, and they practically decided the main bent of his studies. In his second year Dr. Davidson's extraordinary impulsive power was still more strongly felt, and the paper Elmslie read in the class on the "Day of the Lord" showed how thoroughly he had learned to combine in his Old Testament studies the most penetrating analysis with the finest constructive effect in his results. In the

ordinary course of things, two years' attendance at Hebrew is all that is necessary; but when an extra class was formed for the study of the book of Job, Elmslie eagerly joined in it, and took a leading part in what, to those who shared in it, was one of the most memorable experiences of our college career.

In the Church history class, which came in the third year, the impulse was of a different kind, but of a kind which fell in equally with the natural bent of Elmslie's mind. In various universities I have heard lectures in history, but I have heard none at all comparable to those delivered in the New College. They were, it is needless to say, full of knowledge; but that was not the quality which gave them their unique power. It was their candour, their scrupulous fairness, their insight born of sympathy, which attracted men; and the impression they left upon our minds, that, while individual men, as against the Church, had often been right on special points, the true line of Christian advance had never been far from that which the Church had ultimately taken, was an anchor to many, which enabled them, amid their own doubts, to wait hopefully for day.

At the end of our first year I had the great pleasure of going with Elmslie to the University of Berlin for the *Semester*. Neither of us knew much German; but we thought we should more quickly gain a working knowledge of the language by attending university classes in the subjects we were studying, and we felt sure we should more easily get a knowledge of German methods and modes of thought among students, than among any other class. We accordingly enrolled ourselves as students of theology for the summer session of 1869, and in order to make thorough work of our German studies we lived in different houses, though in the same street, and in families where no English was spoken. As a rule, we spent only a couple

of hours daily in each other's company, and endeavoured to keep our speaking of English within that limit. In the university we attended only two lectures, one by Dorner and one by Messner; but we did not distress ourselves if we missed them, for as yet they were only German lessons in the main. Altogether we spent a most happy and fruitful summer.

Besides learning to speak the language we read a good deal, and perhaps that was the main direct gain of our stay in Berlin. But this was Elmslie's first journey outside of Scotland, and acting on a nature so sensitively observant of new impressions, the experience we had of new countries, new people, new customs was most powerfully operative. It was characteristic of him however, that he did not Germanize himself, as some of our British fellow students did. For instance, he was not at all inclined to take the rigorous view of Sunday observance which prevailed in Scotland, but he had not made up his mind as to what the Christian rule in the matter should be. Consequently he adhered in all things to the Scottish fashion while in Germany, for he felt it would be unworthy to forestall his deliberate decision by weakly yielding to the practice of those about him. Others did so, and then, on their return home, took their place again among the orthodox in this matter, apparently without the slightest feeling of incongruity. But Elmslie was made in another fashion, and when he did finally decide for a wider view, he did so on grounds which he felt would justify him at the bar of conscience.

In regard to temperance, his action was similar. From his earliest years he had been a practically pledged abstainer, and though I was not, and he had the constant trial of seeing me join the multitude, he remained true to his conviction. Once, indeed, when we were spending an hour listening to music in a beer-garden, as the custom

of the country is, he turned from his seltzerwater to ask me, with pathetic interest, if the superior beverage I was partaking of was so very enjoyable. But I was happily able to assure him that, to adopt Mazzini's phrase, it was not too good a joy; and I never saw him waver afterwards. In later life, though he remained true to the temperance cause, he allowed himself, when it seemed right, somewhat more latitude; but when he did so, he had no haunting doubts as to whether lax practice, when he thought it wrong, had clouded and obscured his judgment. To many these will seem small matters, but it is in such things that the kind of spirit a man is of is seen.

On our return to Scotland he received the offer of the assistantship to the Professor of Natural Philosophy in his old university, and accepted it, to my great regret, for we saw nothing of each other during the winter after our return. But he was not robust, and he delighted in the work he would have to do, and was glad to have the opportunity of studying medicine for a session, a subject in which then, and afterwards, he was always deeply interested.

At the end of the session, to my great satisfaction, he proposed another summer in Germany together. This was decided upon, and we thought at first of Tübingen or Göttingen. Finally however we decided to return to Berlin. Following our former practice, we lived in different parts of the town, but saw each other constantly. With our experience of the previous summer and our reading during the winter, we were now able to follow the lectures with ease; and we attended Prof. Dorner in New Testament exegesis and Christian ethics, Prof. Dillmann in Hebrew and Old Testament theology, and Prof. Weingarten in Church history, with occasional excursions into the lecture rooms of Rödiger, Professor of Arabic, and Mommsen.

As we were specially interested in Hebrew, Dillmann



made a very deep impression upon us. He was then working at the commentaries on the Pentateuch which have, since their publication, made him famous among Old Testament scholars, as he previously was among those interested in Ethiopic. His knowledge of things Semitic was amazingly profound, and the noble look of the man, to which his character, so far as we came in contact with him, entirely corresponded, impressed us greatly. In the very last letter I received from Elmslie, which was written less than a month before his death, he recalls Dillmann and the teaching we received from him.

But we were by no means inclined to accept blindly what came even from him. Though his influence is now reckoned a conservative force, to us then he seemed altogether too radical. Much of the benefit we received from him therefore was due to the measure in which he incited us to re-examination of things we had thought settled. This he did most thoroughly, and during the whole *Semester* he kept us in a state of intellectual activity, by which we greatly profited. Eventually we, like the rest of the world interested in Old Testament studies, had to admit the truth of much which we then denied.

With Dorner we came into nearer contact in a theological society which met at his house, and we had many interesting conversations with him. He was a thorough German, a profound and robust thinker, but the unhappy possessor of a style which no interest in his thoughts could make more than barely tolerable. We were much struck with the difference between the tone of evangelical orthodoxy in Germany as seen in him, and that to which we were accustomed among many who bought and read his books in Scotland and England. A remark he made about *Ecce Homo* brought out this difference most strikingly. He thought it a profoundly interesting and useful book, and told us that he had distributed it among his

students. Not long before, the Earl of Shaftesbury had denounced it as "the most mischievous book ever vomited from the jaws of hell"; and to Elmslie especially the contrast in the two estimates was the subject of much humorous speculation.

Besides these university engagements, we also taught in the Sunday school of the church we attended; and though our German was not immaculate, the *Engländer's* class was one of the most popular in the school, and was, I think, thoroughly well conducted.

All this was very helpful, but perhaps the largest benefit he gained from our second stay in Germany was the wide excursion he took into the books of Strauss and the other leading writers of the life of Christ from the naturalistic point of view. He read them with sustained interest, for he found in them much which helped him to realize strongly the human side of our Lord's character. Of course, he never was in the least degree tempted to accept their account of Christ and Christianity as sufficient, yet he always said that familiarity with their books had done much to colour his preaching and to make it helpful. None but a man spiritually warm in heart and sound in head would have benefited in this way, and that he thus made the eater bring forth meat is only a proof that in intellectual and moral strength he was greatly superior to most men. At this time too he laid the foundation of his profound acquaintance with Goethe. I do not know that he was as yet deeply influenced by him, as he afterwards was, but his acquaintance with and delight in him undoubtedly began during this summer.

Altogether, I think it had been a most fruitful time for him, and next to the influences at the New College which I have already described, I should reckon this summer's study as probably the most formative force in his student life.

Next winter he joined us again in Edinburgh. By his absence he had fallen out of the class he began his course with, but, except that we did not attend the same lectures, we continued to be together as inseparably as before. He was now well known in the college, and was exceedingly popular, and began to take great interest in the college mission in the Canongate. In connexion with it Elmslie took the infant class, which was taught in a separate room; and there he used to entrance the crowd of delightful little ragamuffins by his dramatic narratives. He admitted no one as a rule, but an exception was sometimes made in my favour; and the skill with which he gained and kept their attention was a prophecy of his future success as a preacher. I heard him once tell the story of a lost lamb, terrified by a lion and rescued by the Good Shepherd. He stood while he spoke, and acted every part of the narrative, even to the start and lament of the lamb when it was pricked in passing through the thorn bushes. Every eye was fixed on him, and when he made the lion roar, the delight was boundless. He was then proceeding to tell of the good and gentle Shepherd, when a small, sharp creature of a boy, with bare feet and many a *hiatus valde deflendus* in his garments, crept up noiselessly, and, pulling the teacher by the coat, said, "A say, maister, let it roar again." And their enthusiasm about their teacher was not greater than the teacher's enthusiasm about them. He laughed about and with them, but it was sincere laughter, "born of saddest thought"; and he strove with all his might to impress them with the belief that the Good Shepherd was very near to them and very gentle, and that in Him was embodied the love of God.

He also joined heartily in the street preaching which was begun and carried on by a few of the senior students. A room in the High Street was placed at our disposal by

Mr. Cunningham, of Queen Street; and our plan was the usual one: to stand in the street, and when we had gathered a crowd by singing and addressing the passers by, we invited them into the room, where other addresses were delivered. At first our efforts produced only open-eyed wonder, which was expressed by a very dilapidated man, who stopped to listen for a moment, and then turned to ask his neighbour, "What dae thae laddies want?" But they found that there was an earnest desire to do their duty and to help them in the "laddies," and many came to listen with interest. I do not know that we had a great roll of what is called conversions; but it touched us all, Elmslie especially, very deeply to see numbers of men and women who had become utter wrecks standing within the shadows of the closes, and at their dark and dirty windows, where they thought they were unseen, listening with sad-eyed interest to the message we were trying to convey.

In the Theological Society, which was the theological equivalent of the Dialectic Society among the university arts students, and which was then in a very vigorous and effective state, Elmslie also took a very deep interest. In it every question of first-rate importance in theology was dealt with, and treated with a freedom which would surprise those theorists who maintain that the young men who sign the standards of the Presbyterian Church are mere babes in criticism, and have never so much as heard the faith seriously challenged. In these discussions Elmslie soon took a leading place, and showed that he possessed the qualities, not only of a thoughtful speaker, but those of a first-rate debater as well.

Of course, in such a society, there was a good deal of crudity exhibited at times, both in thought and expression. In replying to matter of this kind Elmslie was really most unsparing. But his way of putting his criticism was so genial, that those he scourged never quite knew how

severely they had been dealt with. He consequently never lost popularity with those whose nonsense he exposed, and was probably the most generally beloved of all his contemporaries.

During his remaining years at New College he was easily first in all competitions. He won the Hamilton Scholarship, with the highest number of marks gained for years; and at the final examination, though the state of his health was unsatisfactory, and even bad at times, he gained the first place, together with the first Cunningham Scholarship. At this time his desire was to get a professorship. That seemed to him the work which he could most effectively do; but in the Presbyterian Church that is, as a rule, possible only after a certain amount of pastoral work. He accordingly accepted the assistantship at Regent Square under Dr. Dykes. During the summer preceding his last session at Edinburgh, I had left Scotland for Syria and Palestine, and thereafter Australia. Consequently I can judge only from his letters, which were very full and interesting, how his new work suited him. The main impression they gave me was that he grew enormously in practical efficiency as a Christian minister, and that gradually he began to think that preaching might possibly be, after all, his calling. He found, to his own surprise, that the work of the ministry became absorbingly interesting. It gave him ample field for his broad common sense and for his sympathy, and he was filled with delight to discover that he had the power of becoming the peacemaker and the consoler of a whole neighbourhood, and that through his preaching of Christ characters were touched and uplifted. To me, "at our world's far end," it seemed that he was amply fulfilling, even in directions we had not thought of, the promise of his student days, and that contact with the sorrows and sins of his fellows was greatly deepening and enriching his nature. Then came his appointment

to the Hebrew tutorship in the college of his Church in London, and, later, his appointment to the professorship. With this promotion he attained the object of his early ambition; but I think he sometimes looked back with regret to the days when he had lived in closer contact with men.

In 1887 I had the great happiness of meeting him again. After fifteen years' absence from England, he was the one person whom I positively longed to see and talk with; and I had written to him, telling him I was returning, and begging him to spare for me as much of his holiday as possible. When I arrived, in May of that year, he was at Ramsgate, recruiting after the labours of the session; and when we met I found it true what he had written in one of his letters, that if I were to call in upon him suddenly, we could, and would, immediately fall back into the old delightful talks.

I found that he had arranged for a six weeks' tour in Switzerland with Mrs. Elmslie and myself. On our way to Lucerne we passed through Amiens, staying the night, and then went on to St. Quentin, where the non-official synod of the French Protestant Church was then meeting. We both had commissions as deputies, and were very kindly received. By arrangement Elmslie was permitted to speak before the night set apart for deputations, in order that we might continue our tour; and he delivered, in French, a very powerful and beautiful address, much on the lines of the speech he subsequently delivered at the Pan-Presbyterian Council in London. On all sides there were expressions of congratulation, and the members of the synod discovered that the youthful-looking professor who had been sent to them was a very distinguished man. Later, at Lucerne, in the Bernese Oberland, on the Lake of Geneva, and at Chamounix, we spent never to be forgotten days, talking of things grave and things frivolous, as

the moods came and went, and spending quiet hours in the summer woods and by murmuring streams, over Browning, whose poems I had brought with me.

These were almost my last days with him; and I feel it now to be a special grace, that the end of our heart-converse should have been appointed to us amid these exalting scenes, "where Alp meets heaven with snow." He was in his most charming mood, though a trifle overworn; but the fifteen varied years of work and experience which had passed over him since I last saw him had left their mark only in a somewhat readier response to the graver aspects of things. In the main, he was essentially the same. I was struck however with the great development of his varied powers which had taken place. His thinking was energetic to overflowing; and in all directions I found him a continually running fountain of suggestions for change and reform in Church and State alike.

It would not be fair to him to do more than indicate, in the barest outline, my recollection of the drift of some of his talk. Probably he may have put on record some of his suggestions in letters or otherwise, by which he may still speak, but my general impression was, that, more than any man I have met, he had learned to identify himself with the great mass of mankind in their struggles and their aspirations. He was most emphatic in his denial that the working classes in England were out of sympathy with Christ, though he fully admitted that they were not at all in sympathy with the clergy, and much less so than could be desired with the organized Churches. Wherever a man could get at them however, and set Christ before them, he said they were, as a rule, won to respect and reverence. But while this was good so far as they were concerned, the gulf that separated them from the clergy, and in a less degree from the Church, was, he thought, a formidable indictment of the spirit and methods which had hitherto prevailed in

Church work. Manifestly the working classes had been allowed to gather the impression that the Churches, the official representatives of religion, had not been so vividly alive to the evil effects of bad and oppressive legislation affecting the mass of men as they should have been, and that they had shown no enthusiasm of humanity in their political action, or had openly declared that political action lay beyond their sphere. This impression he thought well founded, and his sympathies with the socialistic tendency of much modern legislation was therefore very vivid.

Of course he knew quite well, none better, that man cannot live by bread alone, and that even if all men "had two coats and everything comfortable about them," they would still, but for other influences, be no nearer the spirit of Christ. But, on the other hand, poverty was not, in his eyes, a means of grace. It was rather a hard, cruel, remorseless enemy, fitly indeed called the "wolf at the door"; and he held that it had, when at all extreme, a deteriorating and dechristianising effect. He had helped in many a skirmish against it among people under his charge, and his verdict was that righteousness, as Christ understood it, had no enemy so formidable as the poverty of our large towns. He therefore held that our present social state should be distinctly banned by the Churches, and that they should give their adherents no rest, till they felt it to be as intolerable to them as he thought it must be in the eye of God. I should judge therefore, that he had very little to object to in the socialistic demands; but he saw, as a man of his intellectual grasp could not fail to see, that the socialist measures could not possibly cure the evils they were meant to meet.

As for the atheistic and antichristian propaganda, about which the leading socialists seem even more enthusiastic than their own special business, he regarded it as a piteous aberration which could excite only regret. But he believed



that our social system would have to be greatly modified if it were to endure, and was desirous, or even anxious, that the Churches should resolutely set themselves to prepare men to make the sacrifices that would be necessary. He did not think so merely because it might be possible on these lines to reconcile the working classes to the Church. On the contrary, he felt sure that if the Christian Churches could show themselves more Christlike, and would help to force the State into a Christian mould, there would be no reconciliation to make. But it was characteristic of him, that, while his heart was warm with these ideals, he had calmly looked at the contention on the other side, and had met it. That contention is, of course, that Christianity, in its pity and care for the weak, perpetuates undesirable types, and fills the world with ineffectives, who render the struggle of the effectives harder than it need or ought to be. His reply was, that, while there was much truth in the objection, the remedy was not to build societies upon the principles of a purely selfish struggle for existence. That would be to fill the world with healthy animals, in whom all tender and holy sentiments would be extinguished. On the contrary, what was necessary was to call out into action a whole series of moral duties—mainly self-restraints—which lay implicitly in Christianity, but which our present type of civilization had not permitted to assert themselves. In other words, he thought that when Christianity had such power in our social order that it would be in danger of unduly increasing the number of the weak by compassion, it would at the same time develop so many new and widely extended self-restraints that the danger would be averted. For all this he was full of enthusiasm, and saw his way with a most enviable and unflinching clearness.

But again, he thought the wall of partition between the people and the Churches was also largely due to too much abstract theology in sermons. His faith in Christ had

grown stronger during these years most undoubtedly, and he had for Him a genuine *love*, such as one sees in few men ; but he had, like Mirabeau, swallowed a good many of the formulas with which he had started, and had contracted a dislike for them which I venture to think was extreme. And yet he had much excuse. From the conventional religion, the conventional theologian, the conventional moralist, he had seen the Church suffer untold injuries, and he had even suffered somewhat himself. Moreover, he knew that men of that type had still a preponderating influence so great, that the question of providing for the stability of Churches in which they were not omnipotent did not now arise. He therefore threw himself into the opposite ranks with an *abandon* which he rarely permitted to himself. In doing so, he was greatly supported by his admiration for Goethe. He told me that he had latterly been more influenced in the general trend of his thinking by Goethe than by any one. But it was not the Goethe of the earlier *weltkind* days he meant, nor of the later heathen period, nor even of the days when a *religiös vernünftiger Islam* seemed to him to be the religion we should all have to turn to ; it was rather the Goethe of the last twenty-five years of his life, which Otto Harnack has called the period of his *vollendung*. It dates from the publication of the *Elective Affinities*, and is distinguished by his throwing off the influence of Spinoza, who had in the previous period dominated his thinking. As is well known, from that time onwards Goethe turned ever more decisively towards Christianity, and his utterances on the subject of religion during these last years offer a wealth of suggestion, to which Elmslie's natural bent of mind gave the freest play. He thoroughly sympathised with Goethe's scepticism as to the validity of all complete systems of metaphysical or semi-metaphysical thought.

By this tendency his attitude to dogmatic theology was

greatly affected. He had evidently come to rely much less upon dogmatic systems, and more upon the simple statements of the gospel. These, he thought, contained in themselves as much metaphysic as was either true or useful for the actual life of men. At times he even seemed to imply that metaphysic of any kind was an evil, though he was always willing to add, "a necessary evil." But his permanent mind on the subject would, I think, be exactly expressed by what Goethe says in his *Sprüche* of metaphysic in physics. "We cannot deal effectively with many problems of natural science, without calling in the aid of metaphysic: but not the mere word-chopping wisdom of the schools; we need the aid of that which was before, is involved in, and will be after physics." Similarly the metaphysic which was before, is involved in, and will be after the facts of history, Elmslie felt to be indispensable; but with any other he would have nothing to do, save as an object of curious study. Hence he had little interest in what may be called the secondary developments of Church doctrine, with the seemingly hair-splitting distinctions, such as those about two wills or one in the person of Christ. Indeed he delighted especially in a story of how he, or another, had asked a whole presbytery what their views on such matters were, and after hearing them had proved incontestably that there was not one of them orthodox. They had, every one, fallen into some terrible heresy with a still more terrible name. He did not deny however that such things had their relative worth, and that the discussion of them had been necessary in their time; but they were not fruitful now and for him. Now, with Goethe, he believed that "what is fruitful is alone true," that only that which has a definite power of furthering the highest interests of mankind, of advancing Christianity, in our time was really valid for us; and he therefore turned away from such refinements.

But this was in him no sign of declining belief in the supernatural in the person of our Lord. He regarded Unitarianism as a sign of disease, a mark of weak spiritual health, or of retarded development. But, on the other hand, I think what Harnack says of Goethe applies to him: "Metaphysical definitions as to the Divine or human nature of Jesus Christ were entirely remote from his manner of thinking, directed, as it was, wholly to the practical. These questions belonged for him to the theoretically insoluble problems." But, also like Goethe, he believed that solutions which theory was powerless to discover could be found in practical experience; and he lived by and preached with a rare enthusiasm and power the Divine Christ as He is portrayed in the gospels. Upon Him no human heart, he thought, could altogether close the door; and if any had a different experience, he was inclined to believe that it was because they presented Him in an abstract and metaphysical form, not in the life and power with which He is set forth in the Scriptures.

Another subject upon which he spoke much was the *training* of men for the ministry. From his own experience he was brought to the deliberate conclusion, that, for, effectiveness in ministerial work, the greater part of his training had been useless. He had had to cast away the bulk of it, he said, before he found his hands as a preacher and minister. The reason of this was that, in general, students in theological colleges are dealt with, as if the main object was to make them scholars and specialists. Now in his view, while there ought to be an adequate supply of both these classes in the ministry of the Church, theological training should not be shaped as if these alone were to be considered. Those who have the natural aptitude for this career should certainly find in the course prescribed for them such teachers and other helps as would insure their progress and success, but for the rest they might

safely be left to their own bent. The aim of the professors should rather be, he thought, to send forth men who, while thoroughly educated, should be living men, men of to-day, accepting in the main the present points of view, but having developed in them a definite spiritual and moral purpose to teach and save in the world. Consequently every part of the training should start from the thoughts and tendencies presently working in the world, and the Bible, the Old and New Testaments, should be their main subject of study. But their study of it should be kept resolutely away from the scholastic subtleties of former times. To make the Bible living; to show how it provided remedies for the evils of modern life; to make men see all parts of it in due proportion in the light of all available collateral knowledge; to show how the principles underlying it are the saving principles of the best social life, as well as the only rule for individual faith and manners; and, above all, to make men learn to appreciate it as the record of how God has revealed His highest to the souls of those that wait for Him, should be the chief design. All the other disciplines should be subservient to that, and should secure the freshness and variety they too often lack, by being worked entirely from the point of view which the present profit of men thinking in certain definite directions now would most naturally suggest.

How well he acted up to his own ideal in this matter, the devotion he inspired in his students shows; and had he lived, it is more than probable that he would have been the source of much fresh and vivifying preaching in the pulpits of the Presbyterian Church. It was with such thoughts his mind was full during our ramble in Switzerland, and when I said good-bye to him afterwards in London, I was filled with hope for his future, and for the work he was to do. But it was not to be. Two sessions more of diligent and successful labour were

all that were appointed to him, and now those who knew and loved him have to go "forward over his grave." That it is not easy for us to do; but as he had a singularly high and cheerful courage himself, and resolutely held fast to the faith that the forces that seem at times to smite so blindly are controlled by the "unseen Pity that holds our life in its great hands," we shall best honour his memory by setting ourselves patiently and resolutely to do it.

ANDREW HARPER.

PSALM LXVIII.

*"LET God arise, let his enemies be scattered;  
And let them that hate him flee before him."*

These words and those which follow, in the striking old French version, formed a war-song of the Huguenots, those Maccabees of Reformed Christianity. The psalm was not indeed intended as a war-song; from the beginning to the end the only fighter mentioned is that invincible one, Jehovah Sabáoth. But who can blame these heroes for so employing the *Exsurgat Deus*? Never in modern times have there been soldiers of such steadfast faith as the Huguenots (except it be Cromwell's Ironsides), and so deeply possessed with the truth that the best equipments of war are of no avail without the help of God. The spirit of the psalms had passed into their lives, and though we may not read the psalms precisely as they read them, yet it would be an object worthy of a Chrysostom to make English people sympathise more with the Huguenot feeling towards the Psalter. It is true, the modern Chrysostom will have a harder task than his predecessor; for unless he has assimilated the method and the best results of criticism, he will not be competent to teach those who most need to